LINA EDWIN'S THEATER .- "The Power of Love. NIBLO'S GARDEN.-" Black Friday."

OLYMPIC THEATER.—"Humpty Dumpty" Remod-UNION SQUARE THEATER.—Burlesque. The Vokes

ACADEMY OF MUSIC.-At 21: Philharmonic Re-SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS, -Birch, Wambold, etc.

WALLACK'S THEATER.—"London Assurance." Les-kr Wallack and Charles Mathews

Business Notices.

GOLD WATCHES OF ALL DESCRIPTIONS, Fine Gold Estrings and Pias.

Kirmeon, Cameo, Garoet, Carluncie, Ouyx, Jet, &c.

Golf Watch Chains, Nectisces, Lockets, Seal Rings,
Sleves Buttons, Studs, Gold Thimbles, &c.

Coral Sets. #15, #20, #35, to #100. New styles.

GEO. C. ALLEN, #41 Broadway, near Fourieenth-st.

A tower of strength at this season is found WILLIAM'S ELTRACT JANAICA GINGER. HAS PAID 14,248 CLAIMS-equal to \$700 per

WOOD CARPETING, 480 Broadway.-We refer Wedding Notes, Ball Cards, Monograms, Orders

ARTIFICIALITIES -PALMER'S LIMBS.

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum. SEMI-WEERLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$4 per an WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$2 per annum

Advertising Rates.

Advertising Rates.

Daily Thebune, 30c., 40c., 50c., 75c., and \$1 per line.

EEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 25 and \$5 per line.

WEEKLY TRIBUNE, \$2, \$3, and \$5 per line.

According to position in the paper.

Terms, cash in advance.

Address. The Tribune, New-York.

New-York Daily Tribune.

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1872.

The British House of Commons discussed the course of the Government on the Dublin University bill. The House of Lords passed a bill to pay Roman Catholic Chaplains for their services in prisons. The funeral of the Earl of Mayo took place at Dublin, - Don Carlos is reported in Spain with 10,000 men. A general uprising is threatened. ==== It is rumored that the Duke de Noailles is to be the Minister of France at

The United States Senate yesterday spent the day n discussing the Deficiency Appropriation bill, without reaching a vote. === In the House, a strong discussion took place on the case of Dr. Houard, imprisoned by the

Indians are depredating on the settlers on the North Platte. == John Cooper, colored, was hanged in Cleveland yesterday. —— An extensive fire has oc-curred at Harrisburg. —— Two colored men have been maltreated by disguised men in Kentucky. ==== Immense peat beds have been discovered in California.

The affairs of the Hercules Life Assurance Society are under investigation. - Frederick Kent of West Hoboken attempted to Kill Henry Koch, and then shot him-- Paran Stevens died last evening. = Gold, 1132, 1122, 1132. Thermometer, 640, 850, 600.

No agreement has yet been reached in the Legislature on the pending bill to provide for the Tax Levy for the City and County of New-York. The synopsis of the Assembly bill, as presented in The Tribune to-day, will attract much criticism-especially that section which gives the Controller unlimited powers to settle all claims against the City.

Dispatches from Cincinnati, printed in The THIBUNE to-day, give premonitions of the enthusiasm and excitement which will culminate in that city next week. The delegates have largely anticipated the time fixed for assembling, and are hastening to the field. There is every indication that the Convention will be immense in numbers and strength.

Twenty Thousand Dollars may not be much to save to the State; but the Senate yesterday did retrench in that amount. It decided by a very large vote not to print the notorious Red Book, a gayly-covered annual, which the beneficent members have heretofore distributed liberally among their constituents. The saving is a judicious one, though small purveyors may grieve.

A characteristic story comes to us from Kentucky. A party of disguised men went to a house occupied by negroes, broke open the doors, seized one of the inmates, the other having fled, and cruelly beat him. This done, the man was ordered to quit the country under pain of death. Next day the colored men packed up their effects and went to Frankfort for safety. They call this sort of thing popular government in Kentucky.

The House of Representatives wasted the day yesterday in a fruitless debate over the Houard case. Several members made speeches to prove that Dr. Houard is entitled to the protection of our Government. Several others, among them Mr. Butler, exerted themselves to prove that he was not. And not a man of them appeared to know that six weeks ago the Secretary of State peremptorily demanded his release from the Spanish Government.

The debate on the Dublin University Tests bill, of which an account is given this morning, seems to indicate the incipient stages of a revolt among the Liberals of Great Britain. Mr. Gladstone was admonished by better Liberals than himself that he was inviting a ministerial crisis on an insignificant point, and that the confidence of the House in him was shaken. The direct result of this acrimonious debate was unsatisfactory, but it is probable that Mr. Gladstone's influence has received a blow from which it will not readily recover.

It was a fraud on the people of Texas to grant William T. Clark a certificate of election as Representative from the HIId Congress District of that State. It was a further outrage to keep the rightfully elected member, D. C. Giddings, dancing attendance on the House while the illegally certified member comfortably kept his seat. But we are relieved to know the House has decided not to extend any further the time for Mr. Clark's defense. This shows that there is some prospect that Mr. Giddings will come into his own after a while.

There has been so much satire wasted on the absurdities of the present jury system, it is only necessary to call attention to a bill which the Legislature has just passed to give juries an infusion of intelligence. The bill, which is now in the hands of the Governor, simply provides that a man who has heard or read, or heard read, something about the case which he is to hear tried shall not thereby be disqualified from sitting as a juror. He may even have an impression as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, or the merits of the case to be tried, but if he is willing to swear that he can decide impartially, after hearing the evidence, he is still eligible for the jurybox. This is a considerable advance in the has already aband ned its attitude in relation are confident that, if passed, it will be

line of common sense, and the new law will prevent juries in capital cases from being, as heretofore, almost exclusively made up of dullards, who are willing to swear that they know nothing of facts about which the whole community is talking.

There is now some prospect that consideration of the charges against our corrupt Judges will be had by the Legislature about May 1. Some question as to the pay of members, when it will recommence, &c., seems to have distracted the attention of the Assembly, yesterday, and this small affair rather overshadowed the more important one of the impeachment of the Judges. There is still some very decided talk in Albany about the large corruption fund which has been raised by the friends and allies of the accused Judges, and one local paper goes so far as to divide up the amount, which is said to be \$200,000, into moieties, insinuating that if an Assemblyman resigns in the face of the pending trial, his absence is worth at least \$3,500. This is mean, to be sure, but it is just what Col. Rush C. Hawkins has drawn upon himself by his late childish exhibition of temper. We have not the remotest idea that the foolish Colonel is justly liable to the shadow of such a suspicion. But there is just one thing he is morally bound to do, which will prove the most effective answer to the sneer. He has resigned on the avowed ground, according to the statements of his newspaper friends, that the Reform Legislature is irretrievably corrupt, and that he is able to prove the charge specifically as to men and measures. Let him do lt, and do it at once.

AN UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER.

Our readers will bear witness with what loyal reserve THE TRIBUNE has treated the entire subject of our dealings with England in relation to the Alabama Treaty. While the negotiations were in progress we forebore to embarrass our Commissioners with undue discussion of the questions at issue. As soon as the Treaty was framed we were first to lay it before the country, and to recommend its adoption, for which we endured the malicious attacks of the ignorant and over-zealous partisans of the Government. The imprisonment of our agents and the impertinence of Administration Senators toward THE TRIBUNE did not in the least prevent our giving a firm and consistent support to the Treaty, until by its adoption and ratification the longstanding quarrel between the two foremost nations of the civilized world seemed in a way of peaceful settlement. Even when our Case was presented, and the press of England began to murmur, and at last to break out into hysterical denunciation of our demands, we examined this much-abused document without prejudice, and always with an earnest desire to see such an agreement arrived at as should be consistent with the dignity and the interests of both nations, which after all were not substantially at variance. We found a document, perhaps the most unfortunate in tone and temper that ever issued from any Department of Foreign Affairs. But we did not consider it our duty, while the process was pending at Geneva, to hold up for the derision of our own people and the world, the errors and the weakness of our own Government. The essential point to examine was simply this: whether the class of claims to which such violent objection was made in England was excluded by the language of the Treaty or by the sense of the protocol. We found that these claims were not so excluded, that the "amicable settlement" referred to in the protocol was not the arbitration upon which the Commissioners finally agreed; and that whatever might have been the expediency of putting them into our Case, and whatever the frightful awkwardness by which they were presented in the most offensive manner possible, they were in the Case by that negative right which consists in the absence of any provision for their exclusion. We therefore held, and still hold, that the Tribunal at Geneva was the only power on earth competent to pass upon them; that the attempt of Great Britain to dictate to us what we should put in our own plea was altogether inadmissible; that we should calmly await the verdict of the international tribunal; if it were against us, that we should submit, and if, before it was rendered, England should withdraw, that we should call upon the court for a decision precisely as if she had remained.

We are aware that this was not sound partisan policy. An opposition paper would have seized this occasion to attack and embarrass a hostile administration. But THE TRIBUNE is not a sound partisan newspaper. Where the interests of the country seem to come in conflict with those of any individual or any party, there is no room for hesitation as to what course to pursue. The American Case, shockingly as it was presented, was essentially justified by the Treaty. We took the American side of the question because it was the right one, and we propose to hold it for the same reason. But the servile partisans of the Administration seemed unable to stand the storm of vituperation which beat upon them from England and from timid sympathizers with England here. The most nerveless of its organs in New-York suddenly accused Mr. Sumper of baying interpolated the fatal clauses in the Case : and, incredibly absurd and craven as was this suggestion, it found echoes among the Administration press. Others attempted to throw Mr. Bancroft Davis, who is neither President nor Secretary of State, overboard as a tub to the English whale. The fear of heavy weather seemed all at once to attack and weaken the thick-and-thin serving men of the renomination party. This naturally gave great comfort and encouragement to the hard-pressed party leaders in England, who redoubled their protestations and menaces. This repudiation of the action of the Government grew so general in social circles in Washington that it emboldened the British Minister to come to New-York and in a public speech to declare that "no one supposes that the British Commissioners ever had an idea "that claims for indirect damages were ever ' included in the Treaty." If this is not a direct imputation of bad faith to the Department of State, then words have no meaning. Did those dozen diplomats sit at the same table for a month with their hands on their lips and with cotton in their ears to keep them from saying or hearing anything about the most important question before them? Sir Edward Thornton evidently thinks they did, and intimates that Mr. Fish intentionally kept up this regimen of silence for his own ends. It is not possible that a foreign minister could make such a public statement with-

For several days past a sinister rumor has circulated in this city and in Washington. We regret to say that there is good foundation for the statement that the Administration

out being sure he would not be called to ac-

count for it.

to the Alabama question; that the Secretary of State has written to Gen. Schenck, expressing his regret at the misunderstanding that has arisen, saying that the claims for indirect damages were inserted in the Case because we conceived we had the right to include them. under the Treaty; that the Case cannot be amended or withdrawn, because the Treaty contained no provision for the amendment of the Case except by a Counter Case; but that we expected no award to be made for them; that we do not wish any; that in the interest both of the United States and of England we desire that none may be made; and in consideration of these amiable dispositions of ours, we hope that Her Majesty's Government will permit the arbitration to go forward. If now the British Ministry should refuse to listen to this humble prayer, they are indeed hard-hearted.

This, then, seems to be the foundation of those arcadian dispatches, full of mystery and good will, which for the last forty-eight hours have been coming to us from Washington, intimating that a satisfactory and honorable conclusion of all our difficulties has been reached. It cannot be denied that such a solution would be highly satisfactory and honorable to Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville, who will have obtained it by a trifling expenditure of tall talk. But if the people of the United States are going to regard it in that light, they have changed their character of late years. If this Administration had foolishly allowed us to drift into war, it would have been a deep disgrace. But even that would have injured it no more in public estimation than this unheard of and inconceivable exhibition of incapacity. Truculence is bad enough, but truckling is worse; and what shall we say when both characterize the Government? If this Administration can boast of nothing else, at least it can say it has exceeded all its predecessors in getting into quarrels without cause, and out of them without dignity. __

APPORTIONMENT FOR CONGRESS. Among the duties unquestionably devolved upon our present Legislature was that of dividing our State into thirty-two districts for tae choice of Representatives in Congress under the Ninth Federal Census. As the legislative session cannot be expected long to outlast the hundred days for which only the members can draw pay, we were disagreeably surprised when that term expired without a report to either Senate or Assembly of an Apportionment bill from the Committee to which the subject was referred. At length, that Joint Committee have decisively reported, and now, in view of what they propose, we are rather amazed that they did not wholly refuse or willfully neglect the duty assigned them; for, surely, no report at all would be less discreditable than that they have actually made. We test its fairness by a few ready exam-

The Counties of Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, and Columbia, together constitute that portion of our State lying north of our City, east of the Hudson, and southward of Albany

-a district say 130 miles long by 10 to 40 wide. Across the Hudson facing these lie the Counties of Rockland, Orange, Ulster, and Greene, with Sullivan just behind Orange and Ulster, but more intimately connected with the former. These Counties have, by the late Census, population respectively as follows:

 Westchester
 131,348
 Orange
 80,902

 Putnam
 15,420
 Sullivan
 34,550

 Dutchess
 74,041
 Ulster
 84,075

 Collabets
 42,520
 42,520
 42,620
 Outchess...... 74,041 Columbia...... 47,172 Columbia...... 47,172 Greene....... 31,833 Rockland...... 25,213

[Ratio, 137,000, very nearly.] Let us suppose it the sole object to apportion these Counties fairly and justly, and bearing in mind that Westchester is very rapidly increasing in population-having had but 99,497 in 1860, and being morally certain to have 200,000 within the ensuing ten years, while the rest of these Counties are increasing more slowly, Putnam and Sullivan very little, and not at all-who does not see that their fair and just Apportionment would be as folows?

 Dists.
 Counties.
 Population.

 XI.
 Westchester.
 131,348

 XII.
 Putnam.
 15,420

 Dutchess.
 74,041

 Columbia.
 47,044

 XIII.
 Rockland.
 25,213

 Orange.
 80,902

 Sullivan.
 34,550
 131,348 136,505

In the above table, the two districts which fall slightly below the ratio are very rapidly increasing in population, and will evidently have more inhabitants than any two beside them before this Apportionment will be superseded by another. Now see how the Joint Committee on Federal Relations combines these

Counties: XI. Westchester, Rockland & Putnam. 171,981 XII. Orange and Sullivan....XIII. Dutchess and Columbia.....

-Calling the State ratio 137,000 (which it is nearly) the Committee's bill deviates from that ratio, so far as these districts are regarded, as contrasted with the arrangement suggested by us, as follows:

| Districts. | Committee's bill. Alternative. | XI | 34,981 | 4,652 | XII | 21,548 | 495 | XIII | 15,915 | 2,335 | Total......72,444 7.472

Rockland County is intimately connected with Orange by their common artery, the Erie Railroad; whereas, she has little intercourse with Westchester and none at all with Putnam. To tie her to the XIth District instead of the XIIth is, therefore, doubly unjust.

The Committee's bill preserves and continues and Kings, and in severing Schoharie from Albany and uniting it with Ulster and Greene. But the disparities of population which were tolerated in the last Apportionment have been sensibly aggravated since-the mainly urban districts having rapidly increased in population, while the rural districts have hardly more people now than in 1860. Erie County (including Buffalo) had 141,971 in '60, and 178,699 in '70: increase, 36,728; while Chautauqua and Cattaraugus, which in '60 had 102,288, have now but 103,286. To continue these two districts as they are is to aggravate injustice and defy the equal right of all the people to be represented in Congress.

Two interests fight against justice: 1. That of party ascendency, "feeling power, and forgetting right;" 2. That of personal aspiration. Thus Oneida, with a population of only 105,203 in '60 and but 110,008 in '70, ought no longer to form a whole district; Lewis, with about the right number. But "there is a 'river in Macedon and a river in Monmouth;" a Representative in Oneida and another in Lewis, each of whom, it may be fairly presumed, are of the Two-Term persuasion; so their respective Counties must be kept apart if possible. So in other cases.

We do not believe this bill can pass;

vetoed. Better wait a year than accept such an adjustment as this.

It seems impossible to teach political majorities the policy of doing exactly right. They repeat the blunders of past generations as though they had never been perpetrated and punished. John Randolph may have erred in accounting a majority of one the best conceivable; but there is grave peril in a preponderance so overwhelming as that which befell the Republicans of our State in the present Legislature. It seems unlikely soon to be repeated.

PRINCIPLE AND FLIPPANCY. The Evening Post was moved, on the 22d inst., to signalize an era in its editorial conduct by a restatement of "The Corner-Stone of Our "Faith." That faith, we need hardly say, is

Free Trade-no paltry, shame-faced juggla of "Revenue Reform," but the straight-out, manly thing. In making its profession, The Post forcibly, frankly said:

"Free Trade with us is not a question of expediency, but a question of radical principle, intimately connected with our deepest political convictions, and which it is impossible to separate from the general philosophy of politics. Maintaining the broadest democratic theory of the nature and functions of government, we are bound to hold that all men are possessed of certain natural rights, -rights which inhere in their very manhood, and which are, therefore, anterior and superior to the existence of Governments. These are-first, the right to liberty, or the right which every man has to the unimpeded exer cise of his faculties as a man; second, the right to property, or the right which every man has to the enjoyment of the goods created by such exercise of his faculties; and, third, the right to justice, or the right which every man has to demand of his fellows in the social state that they share equally in the burdens and advantages of the social state, and to their protection against the encroachments of others, by the common

" It is an inevitable deduction from this that all men have the right to apply their labor where they think it best, to derive from it the largest returns which they can get, and to use the results in the way most agreeable to their taste and sense of duty. Government is authorized to interfere with freedom only to assure the simila rights of others, and to provide for its own support in the prosecution of the task. It may tax its subjects to defray the expenses of a legitimate and efficient organization, but for no other purpose. Whether these taxes are assessed directly by excises, or indirectly by cus toms, they can have but one proper end, which is the raising of revenue with the least oppression and the least cost to the community. If they are laid for other ends, . . . taxes so laid are unjustly laid; they are laid without authority; they are an abuse and a wrong, and pervert and demoralize the entire function of the

-All this THE TRIBUNE clearly apprehends. We non-concur in it, because we believe the rightful sphere of government broader and more beneficent than that asserted by The Post. We cannot doubt (for illustration) that Napoleon I. and his successors in the government of France were wise and right in creating her Beet Sugar industry, whereby millions of dollars' worth have been added to her annual product, and that universal luxury, Sugar, brought within the reach of her peasantry who hardly knew the taste of it before. We do not question the sincerity, the integrity of The Post: we only insist that its political economy is narrow, partial, and sadly needs reconstruction. Hence we responded to the propositions above quoted as follows:

"The Evening Post will oblige us if it will distinctly say that it does or does not condemn the construction of the Eric and Champlain Canals by our State as a violation of the natural right of every man to contribute or not contribute to defray the cost of such an enterprise as he shall see fit."

-To this question, The Post makes the following reply:

"We have an habitual disposition to oblige our coten peraries of the press, but we confess that we cannot get through our bair this solemn question. The Erie and Champlain Canals were dead and buried long ago; no one, we believe, proposes to raise them out of their graves; and why we should be called, at this late day and in these busy times, to give an opinion of the pro-priety of their construction in the antediluvian period of our history, puzzles the will, as Ham-let says. Had we been living when those gigantic ditches were undertaken, we should probably had an opinion of them; so we should of the doings of Cheops or of the other Egyptian fellow who built the pyramids; but just now we are too busy in getting the Cincinnati and Philadelphia Conventions to follow the lead of the people and adopt Free Trade, to THE TRIBUNE proposes.

"Let it be understood that we do not mean to speak with the slightest disrespect of the Erie and Champlain Canals; we feel none; they are as irreproachable as any canals we are acquainted with; in their day and generation, they have served the public well; and we have no doubt that they were constructed in the best methods practicable in those earlier eras; but we do object to making their old age miserable by converting them into vehicles (not of freight) but of conundrums and other verbal catches. The ancient Rip should be carefully returned to his native mountains, or perhaps to Capt. Labrbush, with whom he might compare remembrances of the good old days.

" It is possible that THE TRIBUNE, in asking us about Erie and Champlain, means to elicit our general opinion of the propriety of the State engaging in works of 'internal improvement, as it is called, just as Mr. Fish asks for consequential damages, though he do n't want con-sequential damages, and only wants an abstract judgment. Well, we shall satisfy THE TRIBUNE, and tell it that if it will take a file of The Evening Post, and study those luminous discussions which for thirty years or more-as far back, indeed, as the birth of Erie and Champlain—made it a high political authority it will find that we say 'distinctly,' Yes. Having given the answer, we have a question in our turn: 'Will The Tribune oblige us by telling us what or what not it is, or it is not, going to do about it?'

Comments by The Tribune.

The State of New-York saw fit, sixty or seventy years ago, to embark in the construction of navigable water-ways, connecting her chief river on the south with Lakes Champlain, Ontario, Erie, on the north-east, north. and north-west. In so doing, she subjected her people to taxation and debt for objects which nearly half of them scouted as undesirable or unattainable. That portion of her people protested against the right of the majority to drag them into this formidable enterprise (fully equivalent to an the present Apportionment except in this City (expenditure of Five Hundred Millions of Dollars for like purposes at this day) for an object wholly outside of what they then pronounced, and The Post now declares, the legitimate sphere of governmentwhich they insisted was only calculated to aggrandize the few at the expense of the many. They demanded that those who wanted ditches should dig them at their own expense, and not saddle the cost on their protesting neighbors. In short, there is no consideration now urged against Protection by The Post which was not as plausibly, as forcibly, and as honestly, urged then against State Canals. The majority heard them, considered them.

overruled them. They were Protectionists, as the Messages of their Governors, the resolves of successive Legislatures, abundantly prove. They persevered through twenty years, and finished the Canals in question; and ours is now the Empire State, this City the Commercial Emporium, by reason 28,699 inhabitants, added to her, would give just of that beneficent policy-adopted and prosecuted in defiance of that principle which The Post makes the Corner-Stone of its Faith. For, surely, if Government has a right to "tax its subjects to defray the expenses of a legitimate and efficient organication, but for no other purpose," then to tax them for the construction of Canals is and

ever was a usurpation and a wrong.

issue, we leave the exceedingly smart and dexterous replication of The Post to make such impression as it may.

A SERIOUS CASE.

It is nearly ten years since a military com-

mission met at Cincinnati with closed doors to investigate the conduct of Gen. Don Carlos Buell in the management of one of the most important of our Western campaigns. Buell had been relieved of his command under peculiar circumstances. He was an accomplished strategist, but he was over cautious, and caution in the earlier years of the war was a virtue for which neither the people nor the Administration had much respect. He was a conservative in politics, and very free in his criticisms upon the policy of the Government. He was not on good terms with either Grant or Sherman. There were many, consequently, who believed that his removal was dictated by personal dislikes and jealousies, and to this day his offense, if he really committed any, has not been made public. The commission took an enormous amount of testimony. They inquired into all the operations of the whole great campaign, and endeavored to learn who deserved the credit of its successes and who was responsible for its imperfect results. They made a report at last, and sent it to the Secretary of War. Rumor asserted (and some of the truth generally leaks out of these secret court-rooms) that it vindicated Gen. Buell and tore to shreds the reputation of certain more popular commanders. That it disposed entirely of the imputations upon the General's patriotism is evident from the fact that on two occasions subsequently he was offered a command. But what it contained has never been told. It was not printed nor sent to Congress; no official notice of any kind was ever taken of it; no satisfaction was given to Gen. Buell's repeated demands for justice; and when the wronged officer has applied for a copy of the testimony and report he has always been refused. At last the House Committee on Military Affairs was induced a few weeks ago to take action in the matter, and the Secretary of War was requested to transmit to that body a copy of the proceedings of the secret court. Gen. Belknap replied that the papers were voluminous and he had not force enough to transcribe them. Further inquiry revealed the strange fact that they have been removed from the files of the Department, and nobody seems to know what has become of them. The investigation of this startling theft must

be no child's play. It is well known with what jealous care the War Department pretends to preserve its records. They are not accessible to the outside public under any circumstances, even for historical purposes; but it is hardly a secret in Washington that they are accessible to the Military Ring. Now if the Cincinnati and Nashville inquiry vindicated Gen. Buell, it must have irreparably damaged certain other officers of distinguished rank, and it will perhaps not be difficult to ascertain who those officers are. Let us know who had an interest in spiriting these important papers away. Let us know by what influence Gen. Halleck's report of the Shiloh and Donelson campaign has also been suppressed. Let us know why the War Department, reminded of this suppression by a distinguished public man, has refused to make any explanation. Let us know whether it is true that the records of various courts-martial have been removed from the files, and whether it is true that Gen. Badeau has been allowed to carry some of the most important papers of the Department to Europe. And we may as well know, too, what was the nature of the service which the President's young friend, Col. Leet, rendered, when he was arranging army documents before his removal to New-York.

There is a wide-spread suspicion that the Military Ring has been allowed to tamper with these papers. The President must not rest until that suspicion has been removed. While it lasts there is a blot upon his reputation which his best friends cannot overlook. If any officer's fame is to be shielded by theft, it does not follow of course that that officer is Gen. Grant; but until it is shown who the guilty person is, the finger of suspicion points at every man who has access to the records and a possible interest in their suppression. We call for an immediate and searching in-

The American public has a great passion for erecting statues of brass, of marble, of freestone, or of granite; but the chief national peculiarity is that, when the images are set upon their pedestals or pins, so to speak, there rises a dreadful clamor of adverse criticism. There is no public statue, no image of anybody, which has not been ferociously found fault with. There being more statues and taste in Boston, in proportion to the population, than anywhere else, the artistical growling, and grumbling, and as we may say, moral iconoclasm, are most ardent there. The appropriation of \$30,000 by the State for statues of Gov. Winthrop and Gen. Adams, to be sent to Washington, has awakened painful apprehensions in the newspaper mind. 'The Commonwealth," says that nice little sheet The Transcript, "is approaching another terrible peril." If these efforts of art should by any chance prove successful," would it not be better," asks The Transcript, " to retain them here and send away out of sight some of those brazen impostures now cherished among us?" We do not know what our newspaper means by "cherished." Nowhere has there been more fault found with the monumental Webster and Franklin, Hamilton, Washington, Everett, Andrew, and the rest of the mineral and metallic crowd, than in Boston. Politeness has prevented visitors from freeing their minds; but if they find that it will not hurt the feelings of the natives, possibly they may hereafter venture upon a word or two. Perhaps, after all. Bostonians have not been more unfortunate than the rest of the world in this particular. If we may believe the English critics, among all the statues of London there is not a single respectable one. For some reason, there is always disappointment when these things are uncovered. It is the fashion to find fault, for it shows how correct are our art principles; and as, in nine cases out of ten, we find fault with perfect and unquestionable justice, so much the better, since we do the manufacturer no wrong. Moreover, talk keeps up production, and unless we go on trying costly experiments, how are we ever to arrive even at mediocrity !

We have at last a Bishop's opinion of Bitter Beer. At a recent Temperance Meeting in Manchester, Eng., his Lordship of that Diocese related that on the previous Sunday, after preaching a sermon in a very full church, not being in good voice, he had felt a little exhausted when the service was over. Sitting down to a quiet lunch, the clergyman whom he was visiting said to him: "I think a glass of bitter beer would do you good after your sermon." (Laughter.) "I thought so too," continued the Bishop. "I drank a glass of bitter beer, and I believe I felt myself a good deal the better [Cries of "Oh! Oh!"] Now, conces sions like these, made, no doubt, by the right reverend gentleman with the best of benevolent intentions, were exactly what the opponents of grogshop reform wanted; and accordingly a Mr. -So, having elucidated the vital matter in James frwin apparently in the publicans' interest,

if not himself, a publican, made his way to the plat form amid much cheering and groaning, to complain 'that temperance people were more intemperate than the drunkardy." Irwin was, it must be allowed, perfectly logical, only the premises were the premises of the Bishop. Why should the poor people not have a drop of beer after listening to the Bishop's sermon, if he needed a drop after preaching it! The workingmen could not maintain wine cellars, and how were they to get for their Sunday's dinner the beer which had proved so refreshing to his Lordship, if the public houses were to be closed on that day? And yet his Lordship had candidly confessed that a glass of beer was a most useful thing after an excellent sermon. Here ensued more "great laughter," in which the Bishop heartily joined, although it is rather hard to see what he was laughing at. If he had said to the meeting, "I like a glass of beer after preaching, but if it causes my brother to offend, I will drink water;" if he had said this, or something like it, would be not have closed effectually Mr. James Irwin's mischievous mouth ?

Mr. Straight, M. P., is not in favor of a British Republic; and he made a speech on the 10th inst. in defense of monarchy before the Dulwich Conservative Association. Mr. Straight's argument or illustration, or whatever it may be called, was of a character amusing enough for reproduction: "When they had a Monarchy," said the lucid Straight, " the general bulk of the people would take care that the Monarch did not overstep the allotted bounds, but in the case of a Republic, it was like setting the policeman to look after the other policeman. All he could do was to look after the cold mutton and Mary down the area, not caring one bit about policeman number two, and Mary number two with more mutton down another area." Is n't this a true British bread-and-butter view of a great question ? The basis of it is that no citizen of a republic (or, for that matter, of a monarchy) cares for anything save what he shall eat and drink, and wherewithal he shall be clothed. The idea of public spirit, of amor patria, of an unselfish respect for the rights of others, of a deference to the common good, is put entirely aside, and the relation of a citizen to the State, is made merely a matter of cold meat!

Nobody ever carried on any sort of business which he was willing to admit to be offensive to the noses of the neighborhood. Maintainers of nuisances always insist that those who complain of them are deficient in a proper sense of smell. At Bermondsey, England, the Messrs. Salmon pursued the manufacture of artificial manure, out of "putrid fish, the blood and refuse of slaughter-houses, pigs'-hair, decayed animal matter, and garbage of all kinds." Being indicted for this heaven-smelling offense, the Messrs. Salmon urged, in extenuation, that their manufacture did not and could not produce any unpleasant odor. Unfortunately for his case, the Court ordered a view, or rather, we should say, a smell of the premises by the jury; and the whole twelve came back from this visit rampant to render a verdict of "Guilty." The Lord Chief Justice, who appears to have joined in the visit of the jury, declared that the smell setually took his breath away, and added that "such atrocious stenches were a scandal to the sanitary condition of the country." After that the defendants had small chance.

All the circumstances attending the recent execution of Joe Logston, in Tennessee, were disgusting enough. Twice the rope broke, and the man came to the ground writhing in agony and saturated with the blood which poured from his mouth, nose, and ears. We beg pardon of the reader for mentioning these things-we will not dwell upon them. What took place before the turning off was hardly better. The clergymen-there were three of them in attendance - sang: "I would not live always, I ask not to stay." After this, the Rev. Mr. Wright preached an ante-mortem funeral sermon, of course from the 6th verse of the 9th chapter of Genesis. Now, think of a man about to be hung actually compelled for one hour, and this his last, to listen to the preaching of any clergyman who could preach at such a length! Yes; for 60 minutes did Mr. Wright hold forth with this poor wretch trembling before him upon the very edge of the grave. It is not stated that the infliction reconciled Joe Logston to his fate, but if that was the purpose of Mr. Wright's longwindedness, we have not a word to say against it

At Columbus, Ohio, they have been dispeopling an old graveyard, the "remains" to be interred in a new one. The thing has been done often enough, but we have never seen anything like the elaborate report which a Columbus newspaper gives of the exhumation there. The particulars are set forth with startling distinctness. For instance: "The remains of George Krauss were found well preserved Jacob Leib was taken out in a good state of preservation." The remains of a lady are described as "very much decayed except her skull, which was miraculously preserved. A ring found in the grave was taken charge of by her friends." Solomon Miller was exhumed in "a fine state of preservation." In the grave of Mrs. Standish "two copper coins were found," and these, like the ring above mentioned, were taken charge of by relatives present." It must have been altogether a grim little event for Columbus; but the population or, at any rate, the printers, seem to have enjoyed it.

Of course it is not a rule without any exceptions, that godfathers and godmothers mean nothing when they promise to look after the spiritual interests of their god-children; but whatever may be meant, the fact remains that this spiritual relation is rarely thought of with much seriousness. The Bishop of Exeter spoke upon this subject in a recent charge in one of his archdeaconries. - He referred, at Barnstable, to these promises made by god-parents on behalf of infants, and said that many good people felt tender upon the subject of promising this or that on behalf of the baptized. The Bishop thought that it would be advisable to make such a modification in the services of the public baptism of infants as would remove some of the objections-not that it would be possible to remove them all. Of course not. Can anybody imagine any ritual to which nobody would make objection?

From Japan we frequently have interesting intelligence sent to The Erangelist by the Rev. Edward Warren Clark, who is Professor in the Japanese Col lege at Shidz-u-oo-ka. Though specially engaged in teaching natural science, Mr. Clark has a class in Wayland's "Political Economy," and he says that he should teach the Bible and Hopkins's "Evidences of Christianity" to anybody who desired to study them He is popular with the Japanese, and is strongly supported by the high Government officials. Mr Clark mentions a Japanese friend of his who has translated into his own language "Mills on Liberty."

Space in a newspaper is space; and it is no small tax upon ours, whenever we have occasion (as we often have) to mention the labors of Mr. Bergh and his benevolent co-workers, to be obliged to write, 'The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals." Col. Hamley of the British Army has published what he calls a Philozoic Essay in behalf of the animal races. Why should n't our societies for the protection of animals be called Philozoic Societies? The word is well-formed, and expresses the purpose of the Preventers of Cruelty, &c., ex-

They chronicle the death of Thankful Wheeler in Ohio, one of the most extraordinary old ladies we ever heard of, for, though only ninety-three years old, she "remembered the invasion of New-Haven by the British army, when she caught a glimpse of Gen. Washington, who had just been elected President of the United States!" She must have had a powerful memory or a strong youthful imagination.

Samuel N. Pike will be, it is said, one of the principal stockholders in the new hotel for which money is now raising in Cincinnati, sorely in good of more and better accommodations for the travelting pablie. The Cincinnasi Convention has given an imperus to the new hotel protect, and the california are teaking the most of it.